1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332) United States Attorney				
2 3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)				
4	Assistant United States Attorney				
5 6	150 Almaden Boulevard San Jose, California 95113				
7 8	Telephone: (408) 535-5059 Facsimile: (408) 535-5066 Email: benjamin.t.kennedy@usdoj.gov				
9	Attorneys for the United States of America				
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
13	.3				
14	4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No.	CR 07-00595 JF			
15		JLATION AND [PROPOSED] ER EXCLUDING TIME FROM			
16	.6 v.) MARO	CH 26, 2008 TO MAY 7, 2008 FROM SPEEDY TRIAL ACT			
17	.7 OSIEL VERGARA-PEREZ, CALC	ULATION (18 U.S.C. (h)(8)(A))			
18		(II)(0)(A))			
19	.9				
20	20				
21	The parties stipulate that the time between March 26, 2008 and May 7, 2008 is excluded				
22	under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested				
23	continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective				
24	preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the				
25	ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the				
26	public, and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases.				
27	27				
28	28 //				

	Case 5:07-cr-00598-JF	Document 25	Filed 03/27/2008	Page 2 of 3
1	18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).			
2				
3	DATED: March 26, 2008	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney		
4		Omi ca c	rates rationity	
5		/s/ BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY		
6		Assistant United States Attorney		
7				
8	/s/ MANUEL ARAUJO			
9	Assistant Federal Public Defender			
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16 17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between March 26, 2008 and May 7, 2008 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

JEREMY FOGEL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE